

CALIFORNIA

Report on the Lawyer Regulation System

June 2001

Sponsored by the
American Bar Association
Standing Committee on
Professional Discipline

©American Bar Association. All rights reserved.

**CALIFORNIA LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEM
CONSULTATION TEAM**

John T. Berry
Lansing, Michigan

Thomas A. Decker
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Mary M. Devlin
Chicago, Illinois

Gerald M. Eisenstat
Vineland, New Jersey

Paula J. Frederick
Chair, ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline
Atlanta, Georgia

Hon. Barbara Kerr Howe
Towson, Maryland

Jerome Larkin
Chicago, Illinois

Hon. Mary M. Lisi
Providence, RI

Ellyn S. Rosen, Reporter
Chicago, Illinois

INTRODUCTION.....	5
The Lawyer Discipline System Consultation Program.....	5
The ABA Discipline System Consultation Team for California.....	6
Persons Interviewed And Materials Reviewed by the Team.....	6
OVERVIEW.....	8
Strengths of the California Lawyer Disciplinary System.....	8
Components of the California Lawyer Discipline System.....	11
STRUCTURE AND RESOURCES.....	19
Recommendation 1: The Supreme Court of California Should Exercise Control Over the Lawyer Discipline System.....	19
Recommendation 2: Resource Allocation for and Structure of the Disciplinary Agency Should Ensure Complete and Efficient Investigation and Prosecution of Complaints.....	24
Recommendation 3: All Staff and Volunteers of the Lawyer Discipline System Should Continue to Receive Appropriate Training.....	27
Recommendation 4: Appropriate Resources Should Be Devoted to Enhance Public Access and Confidence in the California Lawyer Discipline System.....	29
PROCEDURES	
Recommendation 5: The Rules Relating to Resignations With Charges Pending Should Be Repealed.....	31
Recommendation 6: The Default Process Should Be Clarified and Streamlined.....	33
Recommendation 7: The Decision Whether to Disclose Otherwise Confidential Information In Designated Circumstances Should Rest Solely With the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel.....	35
Recommendation 8: The Use of Early Neutral Evaluation Conferences to Expedite the Resolution of Matters Should Continue With Some Modifications.....	36
Recommendation 9: Rules 182 and 211 of the Rules of the State Bar of California Should Be Merged.....	38
Recommendation 10: Procedures to Place Lawyers on Involuntary Inactive Enrollment for Threat of Harm Should Be Streamlined.....	40
Recommendation 11: The Review Department of the State Bar Court Should Use A More Deferential Standard of Review.....	43
Recommendation 12: Lawyers Petitioning For Reinstatement Should Be Responsible For the Costs of Those Proceedings.....	44

Recommendation 13: Section 6043.5 of the Business and Professions Code Should Be Repealed.....	45
Recommendation 14: Complainants Should Be Kept Fully Apprised of the Status of Their Complaints and Should Be Provided a Mechanism for Reconsideration of the Dismissal of Their Grievance.....	46
Recommendation 15: The Use of the Vague Term AMoral Turpitude@ Should Be Eliminated from the Statutes and Rules Relating to Lawyer Conduct And Discipline.....	48
Recommendation 16: The Rules Governing Lawyer Conduct and Disciplinary Proceedings Should Be Compiled in a More User Friendly Manner.....	50
ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS.....	51
Recommendation 17: The Existing Alternatives to the Discipline Program Should Be Enhanced and Moved to the State and Local Bars.....	51
SANCTIONS.....	53
Recommendation 18: The Issuance of Private Reprovals After the Filing of Formal Charges and Admonitions Should Be Eliminated.....	53
Recommendation 19: The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Conduct Should Be Updated.....	54
CONCLUSION.....	55
APPENDICES.....	56
APPENDIX A: BIOGRAPHIES OF CONSULTATION TEAM MEMBERS	

INTRODUCTION

The Lawyer Discipline System Consultation Program

In 1980 the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline initiated a national project to confer with state lawyer disciplinary agencies upon invitation by the jurisdiction's highest court. In 1993, the Standing Committee and its Joint Subcommittee on Lawyer Regulation made significant improvements to this program, reflecting the evolving needs of the highest courts that regulate the legal profession in each jurisdiction. The Committee has conducted over forty consultations since the commencement of the program.

At the invitation of a state supreme court, the Committee's discipline system consultation program sends a team of individuals experienced in the field of lawyer regulation to examine the structure, operations and procedures of the host's disciplinary system. At the conclusion of its study, the team reports its findings and recommendations for the improvement of the system, on a confidential basis, to the highest court. These studies allow the state to take advantage of model disciplinary procedures that have been adopted by the ABA, as well as disciplinary mechanisms in use nationally. The consultations also provide a means for the Committee to learn of other effective procedural mechanisms that should be considered for incorporation into current Association models.

The team examines the state's lawyer regulation system in reference to criteria adapted from the ABA *Model Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement* (MRLDE). These rules were adopted by the ABA House of Delegates in August 1989 and most recently amended in February 1999. They incorporate the best policies and procedures drawn and tested from the collective experience of disciplinary agencies throughout the country. The team also uses the report and recommendations of the ABA Commission on the Evaluation of Disciplinary Enforcement (the McKay Commission), as adopted by the ABA House of Delegates in February 1992. These recommendations reaffirmed, expanded and added to many of the principles set forth in the 1989 MRLDE. The McKay recommendations also discussed policy and other aspects of the lawyer regulatory structure that were not addressed in the MRLDE. The consultation team utilizes the MRLDE and McKay Report as guidelines to identify potential problem areas and to make recommendations as to how the state's lawyer regulatory system can become more efficient and effective. Team members also carefully consider national practices and local factors in fashioning recommendations. This allows the team to craft suggestions that are tailored to meet each jurisdiction's particular needs and goals.

The ABA Discipline System Consultation Team for California

Upon the invitation of the Supreme Court and the State Bar of California, the ABA sent a team to conduct the on-site portion of the consultation from January 21- 26, 2001. The team was composed of: John T. Berry, Executive Director of the State Bar of Michigan, former Director of the Center for Professionalism at the University of Florida College of Law, past chief bar counsel of the State Bars of Arizona and Florida, former member of the McKay Commission and the Standing Committee on Professional Discipline, and former President of the National Organization of Bar Counsel; Thomas A. Decker, a

Senior Member and Managing Partner in the Philadelphia office of Cozen and O'Connor, member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline, former Chair of the ABA Committee of Corporate General Counsels and past Chair of the Pennsylvania Board of Law Examiners; Mary M. Devlin, Regulation Counsel of the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility and Counsel to the Standing Committee on Professional Discipline; Gerald M. Eisenstat, an attorney in the private practice of law in the firm of Eisenstat, Gabage, Berman & Furman, P.C. in New Jersey, a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline, member of the ABA House of Delegates and a past-president of the Cumberland County and New Jersey State Bar Associations; Paula J. Frederick, Deputy General Counsel for the State Bar of Georgia in charge of the disciplinary unit and managing attorney for the Office of the General Counsel, Chair of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline, past attorney for the Atlanta Legal Aid Society, Immediate Past President of the Atlanta Bar Association and past president of the Georgia Association of Black Women Attorneys; The Hon. Barbara Kerr Howe, retired Associate Judge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, Maryland, member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline, former member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professionalism, former Director of the Attorney Grievance Commission in Maryland, past Chair of the Judicial Disabilities Commission of Maryland, and a past president of the Maryland State Bar Association; Jerome Larkin, Deputy Administrator of the Illinois Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission since 1988 and past President of the National Organization of Bar Counsel; The Honorable Mary M. Lisi, a United States District Court judge in Rhode Island, former Chief Disciplinary Counsel for the Rhode Island Supreme Court and past member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline; and Ellyn S. Rosen, Associate Regulation Counsel of the ABA Center for Professional Responsibility, former Senior Counsel for the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois and past Co-Chair of the Chicago Bar Association's Young Lawyers Section Professional Responsibility Committee. Biographies of the team members are contained in Appendix A to this Report.

Persons Interviewed and Materials Reviewed by the Team

During the on-site portion of the consultation, the team conducted interviews with persons involved in all aspects of the disciplinary process. The team spoke with the Interim Chief Trial Counsel and members of his attorney and support staff in the Los Angeles and San Francisco offices, the current and a former Executive Director of the State Bar of California, former Chief Trial Counsel for the system, members of the State Bar Court and its staff, the Board of Governors of the State Bar and its Committee on Regulation and Discipline, the former Special Master, respondents, respondents' counsel, complainants and lawyers who have had no involvement with the disciplinary system. Members of the team also conducted a follow-up visit with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of California to discuss issues and preliminary recommendations.

The team reviewed voluminous documentation relating to the lawyer regulatory system in California, including, but not limited to, the State Bar Act and other relevant statutes, the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, the Rules of Professional Conduct,

the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct and the Rules of the California Client Security Fund. The team reviewed disciplinary files, caseload statistics and studies, flow charts and training materials.

The team is grateful to all the participants in this consultation for their time, candor and helpful suggestions for improving the system. The team was particularly impressed with the commitment and dedication of the Interim Chief Trial Counsel and his entire staff. They continue to make tremendous efforts to overcome the devastation caused by the 1998 shutdown of the system. Many of the structural and financial challenges faced by the system are unique to California. The desire of the Court to examine the system and study further the issues relating to its role as leader of the lawyer regulatory system is extremely laudable. As discussed in detail below, more Court control over the disciplinary system will promote much needed stability and will encourage the system's continued development. The team hopes that the recommendations contained in this Report will assist the Court with this task.

Nothing contained in this report should be construed as criticism of the State Bar of California. The State Bar has engaged in Herculean efforts to fulfill its responsibilities for the lawyer regulatory system under extremely difficult circumstances. Additionally, the recommendations and observations contained in this Report are not intended as criticism of the legislative or executive branches of government.

OVERVIEW

Strengths of the California Lawyer Disciplinary System

This Report is designed to provide constructive suggestions based upon the team's collective knowledge and experience in lawyer regulation. As a result, the Report generally excludes from discussion those areas of the system that are operating effectively. In order to provide a balanced assessment of the California lawyer disciplinary system, it is, however, important to recognize its strengths.

The Supreme Court of California deserves recognition for its interest in the continued development of a lawyer disciplinary system that effectively serves the public and enhances the integrity of the profession. The Court has the inherent and constitutional authority to regulate the largest lawyer population in the country. Its decisions affect not only lawyers in California, but nationwide. *See, e.g., Birbrower, Montalbano, Condon & Frank v. Superior Court*, 17 Cal 4th 119, 949 P. 2d 1 (1998). The Court's determination to maintain its vigilance over the regulatory process is admirable.

None of the recommendations or information contained in this Report should be construed as criticism of the State Bar of California. Similarly, the information contained herein is not intended as a criticism of the legislative or executive branches of California government. The team recognizes that the historical involvement of these branches of government in lawyer regulation is unique to California, and it has tried to be sensitive to the state's history in this Report.

The entire State Bar has made valiant efforts to overcome the effects of the financial crisis and subsequent shut down of the disciplinary system in 1998 and 1999. As noted in the April 2001 Report of the California State Auditor concerning the State Bar of California, the State Bar has "reduced costs and improved the effectiveness of its disciplinary process by developing a priority system that allows staff to address the most serious disciplinary cases first." The Board of Governors of the State Bar of California includes in its mission statement a commitment to protecting the "...public by effective, timely regulation of lawyer conduct." Volunteers and staff of the State Bar have dedicated significant time and energy to ensure the efficient, fair operation of the system. Their contributions and determination to serve the public are laudable.

This dedication to effective lawyer regulation and public protection is not of recent vintage. The State Bar has demonstrated longstanding support for lawyer regulation. Since the late 1980's, the State Bar has embarked upon a mission to shape its disciplinary system into a model for other systems. As a result of the significant resources the members of the State Bar have devoted to the system, and the dedication of its leadership as well as the Executive Directors and the Chief Trial Counsels, it has succeeded in many respects. For example, in 1994, the State Bar Board of Governors responded to a Report by the Discipline Evaluation Committee created by the President of the State Bar in 1993. That Committee conducted the first study of the discipline system since the implementation of reforms in the late 1980's. The Committee's Report stated that the

system lacked cost-effectiveness and recommended additional measures to increase efficiency. The Board's Committee on Discipline studied these recommendations and in response issued a series of policy directives aimed at further streamlining the system and improving the allocation of resources. Those directives included elimination of a tier of middle management, placing direct supervision of investigations with lawyer managers and dedicating resources to develop diversion and remedial programs.

The State Bar has devoted significant resources and staff to programs that educate lawyers about the system and about their ethical obligations to clients. The State Bar has demonstrated a willingness to innovate in this area. For example, the State Bar led the nation in the creation of an Ethics School and a Client Trust Accounting School. Courses are currently taught by lawyers from the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. The State Bar Court requires all disciplined lawyers to attend one or both of these schools. These courses are now available to all members of the State Bar. Since February 1995, the State Bar's Committee of Bar Examiners has referred applicants to the Ethics and Client Trust Accounting schools if they have been disciplined in other jurisdictions. California also has mandatory fee arbitration of attorney/client fee disputes.

The State Bar and the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel remain interested in developing programs to help lawyers avoid misconduct and to ensure that those lawyers who have committed minor violations of the rules of professional conduct do not repeat their misdeeds. At the time this Report was being written, the legislature was considering a proposed statute that would create a diversion program for impaired lawyers. Lawyers could enter the program voluntarily or be referred by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. Participation in the diversion program upon referral by disciplinary counsel would not mean that errant lawyers would avoid discipline. However, successful completion of the program could result in a reduction in the recommended sanction.

As described below, the lawyer disciplinary structure and process in California is complex. Given the nature of the disciplinary mechanism, it is particularly important that members of the public and the profession be provided with sufficient information to be able to navigate the system and its component services. The disciplinary agency and the State Bar have done an admirable job of trying to make the system user friendly for the public. For example, the system's toll free telephone tree is informative and provides information in several languages. California was also the first state to make information about lawyer disciplinary actions available on its web site. The web site is easy to navigate, and the information is current.

The State Bar of California Client Security Fund also provides a valuable measure of public protection. The yearly assessment for the Client Security Fund is provided for in a statute separate from the one relating to the State Bar dues bill. The assessments paid into the Client Security Fund cannot be used to fund any other program. It is a restricted fund and payments were unaffected by the matters giving rise to the shut down of the disciplinary system. The shut down did, however, affect staffing for the operation of the Fund. Since the shut down of the disciplinary system, the Fund has successfully completed the same amount of work with less staff. The Fund has been well managed by

its staff and the Commission that oversees its operation. Every five years, the Fund conducts an actuarial study to ensure that it has appropriate levels of funding in the future. The Fund also publishes a variety of materials to assist complainants with the filing and processing of claims.

The full-time State Bar Court, which began hearing cases in 1989, was also another first in the nation for lawyer discipline. Since its creation, the mission of the State Bar Court has been to “decide cases fairly, correctly and efficiently.” Over the years, with the help of improvements in technology, the State Bar Court has been able to fulfill its responsibilities with a smaller staff. The State Bar Court has also created a body of case law that is published in its own reporter, thus making it easier for lawyers and the public to research disciplinary law in the State.

In the context of discussing the interest of the State Bar of California in improving the disciplinary system, it is important to recognize the work of those lawyers who represent respondents in the system. California, particularly Los Angeles, has a very active respondent’s bar. Many of these lawyers served as disciplinary counsel prior to entering private practice. These lawyers are not only dedicated advocates for their clients but a valuable resource for the system. The respondent’s bar has an interest in and can be of great assistance with the continued development of diversion and remedial programs. Additionally, these lawyers should be used to educate new disciplinary counsel about the reality and stresses of private practice. Counsel for respondents should also speak to the public and the bar, along with disciplinary counsel, about the operation of the system. Those respondents’ counsel interviewed by the team indicated a willingness to help in each of these areas.

Components of the California Lawyer Discipline System

A. Nature and Funding of the California Lawyer Disciplinary System

At the time of the team's visit, there were approximately 179,000 lawyers admitted to the practice of law in California. The Supreme Court of California possesses the constitutional and inherent authority to regulate the practice of law in the state. Cal. Const. Art. VI Sec. 9, *In re Attorney Discipline System*, 19 Cal. 4th 582 (1998). In 1927, the State Bar of California (State Bar) was created by the State Bar Act. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6000, et. seq. In 1966, as the result of a voter initiative, the State Bar became a constitutional entity within the judicial branch of government. The State Bar of California is a unified bar. Although the State Bar is a public corporation, it serves as the administrative arm of the California Supreme Court with respect to lawyer discipline and admissions to the bar. *In re Attorney Discipline System*, 19 Cal. 4th 582 (1998).

The operations of the State Bar, including the disciplinary function, are funded by membership dues authorized by the legislature. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6140 - 6145. Each year the legislature must approve a State Bar fee bill, authorizing the State Bar to collect its dues. No tax dollars are used to finance the State Bar. The membership fee, which is set by the State Bar, is provided for in the State Bar Act. This fee includes the basic membership fee and other special fees that have been added over time, including the fee for the Client Security Fund.

In 1997, the State Bar was authorized to charge a total maximum membership fee of \$478. It actually charged only \$458. The basic membership fee varied depending on number of years the lawyer was admitted to practice. The statute authorizing the collection of the bar dues provided that it would remain in effect only until January 1, 1998, unless a later enacted law extended that date.

In September 1997, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill No. 1145, which would have renewed the State Bar's authority to collect membership dues for 1998 and 1999. The then Governor of the State of California vetoed that bill. In his veto message, Governor Pete Wilson criticized the State Bar's political activities. He did not criticize the operation of the State Bar's regulatory operations. Despite the veto, the State Bar was still authorized to collect \$77 in annual dues for 1998. Of that amount, \$40 was reserved for the Client Security Fund, and \$27 was available to fund the discipline system.

Subsequent to the veto, efforts were made to negotiate compromise legislation. Those efforts to achieve a bill acceptable to the Legislature and the Governor failed. On June 22, 1998, the State Bar filed with the Court a "Letter Requesting Rule of Court or Order Setting Annual State Bar Membership Fee to Provide Emergency Interim Funding." That letter outlined the effect that the lack of a fee bill would have on staffing and regulatory programming. In response, the Court issued an order recognizing the importance of the State Bar's disciplinary functions, and urged the State Bar, the Legislature and the Governor to resolve the matter as quickly as possible. The Chief Justice also made

himself available to assist the parties. However, the Legislature adjourned for 1997 without enacting a fee bill for 1998 or 1999.

The impact on the disciplinary system was devastating to employees, the public and to the profession, as described in the September 30, 1998 request of the State Bar for the California Supreme Court to impose a special regulatory assessment to fund the system. On June 26, 1998, the State Bar was forced to impose massive layoffs. As a result of this action, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel's staff was reduced from 283 to 23 employees. Many of those employees found other jobs, making the loss of some of the system's most experienced lawyers and staff permanent. Work on approximately 4500 open matters had to be stopped and new complaints that came into the system were warehoused. As of the September 30, 1998 filing, the total inventory of cases pending was 6,556 matters and growing. By December 3, 1998, when the Supreme Court of California issued its opinion and order imposing, among other things, a special regulatory fee to fund the system, the total inventory of pending cases had reached 7600. By March 1999, when the staff began to return to work and the system began to hire new employees, that number had reached 8300. The team concluded that as a result of the shut down and the cessation of the processing of cases, some lawyers who may have been disciplined during that period of time were not.

The State Bar Court was also affected significantly by the shutdown. The State Bar Court was compelled to lay off all but 7 of its employees. On June 23, 1998, State Bar Court Presiding Judge James Obrien issued an order requiring the abatement of all pending cases except those already under submission or serious cases that were set for trial prior to December 31, 1998. State Bar Court judges continued to work during the crisis, but they did so at significantly reduced salary levels.

The Court's ruling in *In re Attorney Discipline System*, 19 Cal. 4th 582 (1998), provided for appointment of a Special Master to oversee the collection and disbursement of a \$173 per lawyer regulatory fee. This amount was in addition to the \$77 authorized by statute. Payment of the \$173 fee was to be by separate check to a special account designated by the Court and not to the State Bar. The \$173 fee provided the disciplinary system with approximately 65% of the resources it previously had.

In March 1999, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel and the State Bar Court began the process of recalling laid off employees and hiring new ones. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel was able to rehire 37 lawyers who had previously worked for the system. However, a significant number of the new hires had little experience. The need to train these lawyers about the nature and operation of the system as well as how to investigate and prosecute allegations of misconduct slowed the start up of the system. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel worked closely with the Special Master to develop priorities for investigating and prosecuting cases so that the most serious cases would be prosecuted promptly and others would be handled in accordance with available resources. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel continued to modify those priorities as needed to accommodate the system's recovery from the 1998 crisis and to deal as effectively as possible with fewer resources.

B. Structure and Operation of the California Discipline System—Investigation and Prosecution

The State Bar Board of Governors retains oversight responsibility for the Bar's disciplinary activities. The Board accomplishes its oversight through its Committee on Regulation and Discipline (CORD). The Board may promulgate rules of procedure for disciplinary and regulatory proceedings. Bus. & Prof Code, Sec. 6086.1. These supplemental rules are contained in the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California.

The Chief Trial Counsel

Pursuant to statute, the Board hires the Chief Trial Counsel, who must be confirmed by the Senate. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6079.5. The Chief Trial Counsel serves a four year term and may be reappointed for additional four year terms. The Chief Trial Counsel serves at the pleasure of the Board and reports directly to CORD. The Chief Trial Counsel is responsible for managing the daily operations of the prosecutorial branch of the disciplinary system. The Chief Trial Counsel hires the Deputy Chief Trial Counsel.

The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel includes the:

Intake Unit

The Intake Unit receives information regarding possible lawyer misconduct. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6068.10, 6086.7 and 6086.8. The Intake Unit is staffed by lawyers, including one Assistant Chief Trial Counsel, and complaint analysts who are not lawyers. They analyze the incoming information to determine if the agency has jurisdiction and if the facts alleged in the complaint, if true, would constitute in a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or the State Bar Act. The evaluation of complaints at this level determines whether a case will proceed to the Enforcement Units for investigation and prosecution, or whether the matter can be resolved at the intake level.

The majority of initial contacts with the discipline system are through the Intake Unit's toll free telephone line. The toll free telephone line is currently staffed by complaint analysts for only four hours a day. The availability of staffing for the toll free number was decreased after the 1998 shutdown of the system. Prior to that time it was staffed for eight hours a day. When complaint analysts are not available to field telephone inquiries in person, complainants are referred to the toll free line's phone tree system. The phone tree operates 24 hours a day. The phone tree provides information to help callers to resolve matters on their own or to file a complaint if they wish. The phone tree contains information about State Bar programs and also provides answers to frequently asked questions. Callers to the phone tree have the option of participating in that system in at least three languages, in addition to English. A caller who is using the phone tree always has the option to opt out and speak with a complaint analyst if the call is during those hours of operation of the toll free line.

As in most disciplinary systems throughout the nation, many complaints received by the Intake Unit do not allege a violation of the rules so as to rise to the level where investigation or formal prosecution is warranted. Many of these complaints can be resolved informally over the telephone, before or after contact with the respondent, or the matter can be referred to a diversion program such as fee arbitration. The complaint analysts, with oversight by the Unit's lawyers, perform this function. As a result of the shut down, the system has had to direct resources away from the nondisciplinary dispositions such as referral to alternatives to discipline programs and the issuance of warning letters. Instead, the complaint analysts issue resource letters that direct the lawyer to Ethics School or Client Trust Accounting School. The team was advised that the reduction in resources and refocused mission has also resulted in delays for the Intake Unit to follow up with respondents on matters that cannot be closed immediately.

The Intake Unit utilizes the priorities set by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel to determine how to handle incoming complaints. Complaints that fall under the top two priorities (those demonstrating the greatest harm to the client and/or the public that are likely to result in at least a one year suspension, and those matters likely to result in discipline ranging from public reproof to a one year suspension) are referred to the Enforcement Units directly. Resource letters are drafted in cases where violations are alleged, but there is no apparent substantial harm to clients or the conduct would not likely lead to discipline.

General Investigation Unit

In Los Angeles, the General Investigation Unit consists of lawyers, investigators and paralegals who are responsible for investigating most of the complaints that are forwarded from the Intake Unit to determine if there is sufficient evidence to warrant the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. An Assistant Chief Trial Counsel supervises the unit. The Supervising Deputy Trial Counsel (team leader) is supervised by the Assistant Chief Trial Counsel, and provides the majority of project management to the Unit. The investigators and paralegals work under the supervision of the other Deputy Trial Counsel. The number of Deputy Trial Counsel available to perform investigative duties has been reduced since the 1998 shutdown. A number of lawyers now employed in this capacity do not have the same level of experience as those so employed prior to the shut down. The number of investigators remains the same.

In San Francisco, there is a blended unit that mirrors the functions of the General Investigations and Specialty Prosecutions Units in Los Angeles. Lawyers in the San Francisco office operate under a vertical prosecution model. The same lawyer handles investigations and prosecutions, as well as their own appeals. The San Francisco office coordinates with the Los Angeles office as needed on cases and training.

When a case is referred from the Intake Unit, the Assistant Chief Trial Counsel reviews the file to determine if there are other open matters relating to that respondent. If so, the matter is assigned to the investigator involved in those cases. If not, the case is assigned to a Deputy Trial Counsel and investigator. The investigation may consist of

correspondence with the complaining witness and respondent, the gathering of necessary documents and court files and interviews with the complainant, respondent and other witnesses. The consultation team was advised that the investigators are given discretion as to the manner in which the investigation proceeds, but they do consult with supervising Deputy Trial Counsel about the progress of their work and legal issues related to the investigation.

Section 6054 of the Business and Professions Code requires state and local law enforcement agencies to cooperate with the disciplinary agency's investigations. This includes providing criminal history information about respondents. The team was told that the General Investigation Unit has the ability to subpoena witnesses, including respondents, to provide testimony during the course of the investigation. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6049, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, Rule 2502. These provisions refer to witnesses. Those who do not obey the subpoenas are subject to contempt proceedings. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6050. Information provided to the consultation team indicates that there are a noticeable number of cases where the respondent does not provide information to the investigators in response to inquiries. Respondents are permitted to refuse to answer questions if applicable constitutional privileges apply. Despite the failure of respondents to provide information to the agency, the use of investigative subpoenas to elicit a response from them is minimal.

Lawyers serving as Deputy Trial Counsel in the General Investigations Unit review the investigators' reports and determine if there is sufficient evidence to warrant the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges, or if a file should be closed. If there is sufficient evidence to proceed, the Deputy Trial Counsel also conducts any prefiling settlement discussions and participates in the Early Neutral Evaluation Conference (ENEC). If the matter cannot be settled after one or more ENECs, the Deputy Trial Counsel drafts the Notice of Disciplinary Charges and files it with the State Bar Court.

Effective February 1999, Rule 75 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California requires a State Bar Court judge, at the request of either party, to conduct an ENEC if the parties are unable to reach an agreed disposition prior to the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The State Bar Court judge is to hold the ENEC within 15 days of a party's request. The team was advised that it takes longer to schedule and hold the ENEC. The ENEC judge is to provide the parties with a neutral evaluation of the merits of the case and the likelihood that discipline would be imposed if the matter proceeded to trial. The ENEC judge is to be provided with a draft of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges along with any other evidence supporting the allegations. The respondent may provide documents to the ENEC judge as well. Both sides may designate documents confidential, to be examined by the ENEC judge *in camera* and not shared with the other party.

If the matter can be resolved as a result of an ENEC, the Deputy Trial Counsel is required to document the resolution and the ENEC judge may approve or reject the proposed agreement. Additional ENECs may be ordered by the judge. A judge who participates in an ENEC cannot act as the trial judge in the same matter, unless the parties so stipulate.

General Trials Unit

In Los Angeles, the General Trials Unit is responsible for litigating most Notices of Disciplinary Charges before the State Bar Court. Other matters are referred to the Specialty Prosecutions Unit. The General Trials Unit is managed by an Assistant Chief Trial Counsel. In Los Angeles, there are 14 lawyers in this Unit. The team was advised that in San Francisco, the blended unit's lawyers who investigate the complaints and file the Notices of Disciplinary charges are responsible for the litigation of those cases. The team was advised that the bulk of the trial lawyers in the Los Angeles office of this Unit have 18 months or less experience with the State Bar. Lawyers in that office currently have caseloads of approximately 40-50 matters. The more experienced lawyers may have higher caseloads. In San Francisco, each Deputy Trial Counsel has a caseload of approximately 33 matters. Approximately 20% of all cases where a Notice of Disciplinary Charges is filed go to trial. The General Trials Unit in Los Angeles receives additional investigative assistance from the General Investigations Unit.

Specialty Prosecution Unit

In Los Angeles, the Specialty Prosecution Unit investigates and litigates immediate priority matters such as cases involving involuntary inactive status (similar to interim suspension for threat of harm), insurance fraud cases, complex misappropriation cases, reinstatement and moral character matters, contempt cases, illegal solicitation cases and unauthorized practice of law complaints. The General Trials Unit can also initiate involuntary inactive status cases. The Specialty Prosecution Unit is unique in the Los Angeles office, in that it operates under a vertical prosecution model. The lawyers and investigators work together closely. The progress of cases is more lawyer driven, and those who investigate matters are also responsible for their prosecution.

Appellate Unit

In Los Angeles, two full time lawyers and one part time lawyer are responsible for pursuing appeals before the Review Department of the State Bar Court. In San Francisco, appeals are handled by 2-3 lawyers. There are approximately 23 appeals filed statewide. The Los Angeles office handles two-thirds of the appeals. The Appellate Unit also handles interlocutory appeals from State Bar Court rulings. The General Counsel's Office handles appeals that proceed before the Supreme Court of California.

The team leader in the Los Angeles office is also responsible for conducting training sessions in Los Angeles. The team leader circulates a newsletter containing recent decisions and conducts a monthly evidence code study group. The San Francisco unit conducts similar, concurrent training.

Professional Competence Unit

The Professional Competence Unit operates from the San Francisco office. The Professional Competence Unit administers the State Bar's professional responsibility programs and publications. The Office of the General Counsel oversees this unit. The Professional Competence Unit operates the Ethics Hotline, the Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct, which issues ethics opinions and advises the Board of Governors about proposed changes to the California Rules of Professional Conduct, and the Lawyers Personal Assistance Program. The Competence Unit is responsible for preparing and filing proposed amendments to the Rules of Professional Conduct with the Supreme Court of California.

The Competence Unit publishes the *California Compendium on Professional Responsibility*, the *California Rules of Professional Conduct and the State Bar Act*, the *Handbook on Client Trust Accounting for California Attorneys* and *Supreme Court Rule Filings*.

C. Structure and Operation of the California Discipline System—The State Bar Court

The State Bar Court performs the adjudicatory functions of the lawyer discipline system. The State Bar Court, in its current form, was established in 1989 pursuant to an amendment to the State Bar Act. Bus. & Prof. Code, Secs. 6079.1 and 6086.5. The State Bar Court is organized into a Hearing Department and a Review Department. Bus. & Prof. Code, Secs. 6079.1 and 6086.65. The Supreme Court of California appoints the presiding judge and the review judges of the State Bar Court. Bus. & Prof. Code, Secs. 6079.1 and 6086.65.

The Hearing Department of the State Bar Court consists of five hearing judges. The Supreme Court of California appoints two hearing judges, the Governor of California appoints one judge, the Speaker of the California Assembly appoints one judge and the Senate Committee on Rules appoints one judge. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6079.1. The judges of the State Bar Court are appointed for six year terms. They may be reappointed for additional six year terms. Bus. & Prof. Code, Secs. 6079.1 and 6086.65. These judges are subject to discipline and removal by the Supreme Court of California in the same manner as other state court judges.

The Hearing Department is the trial level of the State Bar Court. Additionally, judges from the Hearing Department conduct Early Neutral Evaluation Conferences. These judges may impose public or private reprimands. California Rules of Court, Rule 951. They may also order lawyers to be placed on involuntary inactive enrollment status. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6007. In cases where suspension or disbarment is appropriate, the hearing judges issue written findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations for discipline. These recommendations for discipline must be approved by the Supreme Court of California.

The Review Department of the State Bar Court is the appellate tribunal. It consists of a presiding judge and two other judges appointed by the Supreme Court. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6086.65. This three judge panel reviews Hearing Department matters statewide where at least one party has sought that review. The Review Department conducts a *de novo* review of the underlying proceedings and may adopt findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations for discipline that are different from those of the trial judge. California Rules of Court, Rule 951.5. The Review Department issues written opinions that become precedent for the State Bar Court and persuasive authority in other courts. Their rulings are cited in the California State Bar Court Reporter.

The Hearing and Review Departments are supported by Court Counsel and Case Administrators. The Court Counsels' duties include providing legal advice to the State Bar Court judges and assisting in the drafting of rules and guidelines relating to the State Bar Court, conducting legal research and preparing bench memos and draft decisions. Case Administrators process pleadings filed in the State Bar Court, file and serve orders and decisions, assist in the management of the judges' calendars, maintain the court's computerized case management system and provide support to the judges in court through auto-recording testimony, swearing witnesses and handling exhibits.

The State Bar Court also reorganized its staff structure after the shut down of the system. In March 1999, the court reduced its staff from 52 to 34. The State Bar now has an authorized staff complement of 37 employees. Of that number, 27 positions have been filled.

STRUCTURE AND RESOURCES

Recommendation 1: The Supreme Court of California Should Exercise Control Over the Lawyer Discipline System

Commentary

In every state, including California, the regulation of the practice of law is inherently a function of the judicial branch of government. The California Supreme Court also retains the primary constitutional authority regarding the regulation of lawyers. Article VI, Section 9 of the California Constitution provides that the State Bar of California is a public corporation located within the judicial branch of government. For purposes of discipline and admissions, the State Bar of California acts as an administrative arm of the Court. *In re Attorney Discipline System*, 19 Cal. 4th 582 (1998); *Brotsky v. State Bar*, 57 Cal. 3d 287, 300 (1962). The California Legislature, throughout the State Bar Act, has expressly recognized that the Court's ultimate power over the admission and disciplining of lawyers is vital to the constitutionality of that Act. *In re Attorney Discipline System*, 19 Cal. 4th 582 (1998); Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6087. Similarly, the Court has consistently recognized the role of the Legislature in the regulation of the practice of law in California. *Id.*, at 602.

The Legislature's role in the regulation of the profession is set forth in the State Bar Act, which was enacted in 1927. The State Bar Act contains statutes that provide for a disciplinary structure and procedures that are supplemented by the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California. Those Rules are adopted by the Board of Governors of the State Bar in accordance with statutory authority. The disciplinary agency's operations are funded by membership dues authorized by the Legislature. No tax monies are used to finance the State Bar.

In order for any lawyer discipline system to be effective and efficient it must have a stable and adequate source of funding, be free from political influence and possess stability with respect to human resources. A strong, effective discipline system is essential to protect the public and assure public confidence in the competency and integrity of the bar. Having carefully reviewed all aspects of the California disciplinary system, the consultation team believes that the current system lacks such stability. The team strongly recommends that the best way for the system to obtain the stability and independence that it needs to operate effectively and efficiently in the future is for the Court to assert greater control over the system's prosecutorial and adjudicatory functions. The changes suggested by the team will clarify the Court's role in relation to the roles played by the Legislature and the Governor of the State of California with respect to the regulation of the profession. If necessary, the state Constitution should be amended to clarify the distinct roles and powers of these branches of government with respect to the lawyer disciplinary system, consistent with the California Supreme Court's ruling in *In re Attorney Discipline System*, 19 Cal. 4th 582 (1998).

First, the team recommends that the administration of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel and the State Bar Court be transferred to the Supreme Court. The judiciary's assumption of administrative control of both the prosecutorial and adjudicatory functions will promote public confidence in the system by enhancing the independence of the agency from the State Bar. When elected bar officials control all or parts of the disciplinary process, the appearance of impropriety or of conflicts of interest is created, regardless of the actual fairness and impartiality of the system. This is true whether the bar is unified or not. ABA Model Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement (MRLDE), Rule 2 and Comment. Direct judicial oversight of the disciplinary functions will help alleviate any public misperception that the disciplinary agency is overly protective of lawyers and gives proper credit to the Court for the efforts of its agency.

Additionally, the Supreme Court should, as described below, provide for the long term, stable funding of the system via order or rule of court. The team believes that the current method of funding the system through legislative and executive approval of a State Bar Dues Bill substantially impairs, or creates a substantial enough risk of interference, with the Court's inherent judicial authority over the disciplining of lawyers. The creation of a reliable source of funding would ensure that the system successfully and permanently emerges from its current state of fragility that affects staffing, morale, efficient processing of cases, service to the public and ultimately the public's confidence in the profession and the judicial system.

Moving the State Bar Court and the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel from the State Bar to the judiciary does not have to increase the Court's already significant administrative duties. The team recommends that the Supreme Court create and delegate to a commission or board, separate from the State Bar of California, the responsibility for overseeing the operation of the lawyer discipline system. The team recommends that this entity be comprised of lawyers and nonlawyers from diverse backgrounds, and that it report directly to the Court. The participation by nonlawyers in the lawyer discipline system is an effective way to promote public confidence in the system. However, the chair of the oversight entity should be a lawyer.

The Court should appoint the members of the oversight entity. The team recommends that the majority of the members be lawyers and that the Court create an entity of sufficient size to efficiently undertake its responsibilities. The Court may wish to continue the cooperative arrangement with the other branches of government by permitting the Governor and the Legislature to appoint the public members to this body. Unlike the rest of the nation, the California legislative and executive branches of government have historically maintained extremely active roles in the regulation of the profession. The appointment power reserved for the Legislature and the Governor with respect to the oversight entity could be similar to that contained in Section 6079.1 of the Business and Professions Code relating to the appointment of State Bar Court Hearing Judges. Members of the oversight entity should serve three or four year terms and may be reappointed for one additional consecutive term. Their terms should be staggered to ensure continuity and the development of an institutional memory.

The team recommends that the oversight commission be responsible for reviewing the productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency of the entire system. It should be accountable to the Court for the system's effectiveness. MRLDE 2 and Comment. By delegating this authority to an oversight body, the Court would be relieved of any additional administrative burdens of managing the lawyer discipline system. At the same time, this method would assure that the system would be insulated from political pressures. The team recommends that the oversight entity's responsibilities include the review and adoption of budget proposals for the discipline system and the provision of an annual report about the system to the Court. The oversight entity would also be responsible for ensuring effective caseload management for the system, proposing recommendations for rules changes, and educating the public about the system. The oversight entity should propose to the Court changes to the substantive and procedural rules for the system. The oversight entity should examine those rules on a regular basis. It is also important for the State Bar to have a role in proposing such rules.

Also, the California Supreme Court should appoint the Chief Trial Counsel. MRLDE 4 and Comment. This would be consistent with national practice and would not constitute a conflict of interest. Direct management of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel would be conducted by the oversight entity, thus eliminating any appearance of impropriety with respect to the handling of individual cases. However, the oversight entity's management of the system should not extend to directing the Office of Chief Trial Counsel regarding the manner in which cases are investigated and prosecuted. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel must have the discretion and independence to make investigative and prosecutorial decisions without interference. The Court's appointment of the Chief Trial Counsel is analogous to the Court appointing State Bar Court Hearing Judges with respect to conflicts of interest. In *Lebbos v. State Bar*, 53 Cal. 3d 37, 41, fn. 1 (1991), the Court found meritless the assertion that it was a conflict of interest for it to appoint State Bar Court Judges and then review their decisions. The Court may wish to delegate the hiring process to the new oversight entity. However, the Court should formally approve its choice. In those instances where the Chief Trial Counsel meets with the Court about the system, there would be no discussion of individual cases or issues in cases that might come before the Court. Only information relating to the effective and efficient operation of the system would be addressed.

The Chief Trial Counsel should not serve for any specified term but should serve at the pleasure of the Court. This should provide the Chief Trial Counsel the independence needed to operate a fair and efficient system for lawyers and the public, yet retain adequate accountability. Disciplinary counsel needs to be insulated from political pressures.

If the disciplinary function remains with the State Bar, the Court or its oversight entity with Court approval, should still appoint the Chief Trial Counsel and that position should still serve at the pleasure of the Court. Further, the Court should direct the State Bar to create an independent entity whose members do not serve on the Board of Governors to oversee the administration of the discipline system. This would be the entity's only role. It should consist of lawyer and nonlawyer members. The members of this entity would

be appointed subject to the Court's approval. In keeping with the unique nature of California's lawyer regulatory process, the Legislature and the Governor should be permitted to appoint public members to this entity. This independent entity would not be responsible to the Board of Governors, but to the Court. The creation of such a body by the State Bar at the direction of the Court is consistent with the Bar's role as an administrative arm of the Court that functions under the judiciary. It also allows the Board of Governors of the State Bar to devote its resources to bar related activities and programs more efficiently. Information provided to the team demonstrates that the State Bar is very interested in enhancing programs offered to lawyers that would not only improve their practices, but help the public.

If the investigative and prosecutorial functions remain within the State Bar, at the very least, the Court should remove the State Bar Court from the aegis of the Bar. The Court should direct that the State Bar Court change its name so that it is more closely associated with the Court and not the Bar. This will eliminate the perception that the prosecutorial and adjudicative functions of the disciplinary agency are inappropriately intertwined, when in fact they are completely separate. The team suggests a name such as, "The Lawyer Regulatory Court of the Supreme Court of California" or the "Supreme Court of California Disciplinary Court." The Court could delegate administration of and budgeting for this court to the oversight entity described above. This court's judges should receive appropriate training in mediation, and they should establish trial and appellate court workload standards. The State Bar Court is currently studying such standards proposed by the National Center for State Courts.

As noted above, the Supreme Court of California should take steps to ensure stable and permanent funding for the disciplinary agency and its components. The Court must ensure that the disciplinary budget cannot suffer because of the risk of legislative or executive branch disagreements or concerns about State Bar activities. This may involve promulgating a rule designating the disciplinary budget as a protected fund consisting of a Court imposed regulatory fee collected by the Bar at the same time as it collects its dues. The team believes that the preferable method of collecting such monies is to have lawyers pay the regulatory fee directly to the Court. However, the team recognizes that in California the first suggestion may prove more practical. Since taxpayer dollars do not comprise the disciplinary budget, the Legislature should not object to separating the disciplinary budget from that for the State Bar's other functions. There is no dispute that the Court has the authority to impose such a fee in furtherance of its inherent regulatory authority. *In re Attorney Discipline System*, 19 Cal. 4th 582 (1998).

In order to determine adequate financing for the system well into the future, the Chief Trial Counsel should prepare a proposed budget reflecting a true needs assessment and future planning for the system and submit it to the Court's new oversight entity. If necessary, expert financial planners or budget analysts should be used to assist the Chief Trial Counsel in assessing the current and future needs of the system in terms of finances, technology and staffing. Any assessment of current and future needs should be based on a system that is operating on a current basis, with existing backlogs eliminated. Financial planning for the discipline system should ensure that any regulatory fees remain stable

for a period of time such as a three to five year or longer cycle, so that annual increases are not necessary.

The Chief Trial Counsel should be responsible for annual preparation of the budget of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel for submission to the new oversight entity created by the Court. As noted above, the oversight entity should approve the budget. In the event that there are disagreements about the budget, both the Chief Trial Counsel and the oversight entity could submit separate budget proposals to the Court. The oversight entity could also receive the budget for the disciplinary court, prepared by the presiding judge. The same procedure can be followed in the case of disagreements about that tribunal's budget as with the budget for the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel.

Recommendation 2: Resource Allocation for and Structure of the Disciplinary Agency Should Ensure the Complete and Efficient Investigation and Prosecution of Complaints

Commentary

The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel and the State Bar Court continue to try to recover from the 1998 shutdown of the system. As noted generally in the Overview section of this Report, the total inventory of cases pending (inquiries, investigations and matters awaiting the drafting of charges and/or filing with the State Bar Court) upon staff's return in March 1999 was 8300 matters. Of that number, 2272 were backlogged investigations. Generally an investigation is considered statutorily backlogged if it is not completed in six months or twelve months if the matter has been designated as complex. Currently, the inventory of pending cases is 5122, with a statutory backlog of 1306 matters calculated in the manner described above.

The team was advised that as a result of the 1998 shutdown of the system, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel lost approximately 700 years of collective experience due to layoffs. While some of those experienced counsel returned to the State Bar, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel had to hire many new lawyers with little or no practice experience. As a result, the system has had to overcome a steep learning curve. The Interim Chief Trial Counsel and his entire staff deserve immense praise for winnowing the existing inventory to its current state and resurrecting the system. There is, however, still much work to be done to recreate an effective, even proactive, lawyer regulatory system.

The disciplinary agency should continue its efforts to prioritize the handling of cases in the system in order to eliminate current backlogs within a reasonable period of time and to ensure the future fair, complete and efficient investigation and prosecution of cases. Currently, each investigator maintains a caseload of approximately 30-40 matters. The lawyers in the General Trial Unit have caseloads of approximately 40-50 cases. In order to plan for appropriate caseload levels once the system is current, the experience of the lawyer and investigator, the nature of their duties and the complexity of cases must be considered. For example, lawyers in the General Trial Unit may be able to handle more cases than those in the Specialty Prosecutions Unit because of the complexity and voluminous nature of the matters that the latter department handles. As recent law school graduates and new investigators gain more experience, their caseloads can increase. The Chief Trial Counsel should take these factors into consideration when recommending workload and staffing standards for the agency.

The team is aware of the 2001 workload study. Any new workload standards developed for the system should include time guidelines for the processing of cases. Investigation and the filing and service of notices of disciplinary charges or other dispositions of routine matters generally should be completed within six months. Complicated matters should be completed within twelve months. This conforms to existing guidelines in use

for determining when a matter is to be backlogged. The period of time from the filing and service of notices of disciplinary charges to the filing of the State Bar Court judges' opinions should generally not exceed six months, but may be longer in complex matters. The period for appellate review should also generally not exceed six months. MRLDE 11 and Comment.

The Intake Unit's toll free number should be staffed full time. Currently, it is only staffed for four hours every day. Adequate resources should be provided to staff the toll free line with trained complaint analysts and/or lawyers. The Intake Unit is the gateway to the system, and it must be able to complete its high volume initial screening and resolution of complaints completely and expeditiously with as much personal attention as possible. Lawyers and complaint analysts in the Intake Unit should be provided with standards and priorities for the referral of matters to diversion programs, so that they can promptly and appropriately resolve matters. Their decisions affect the caseload for the entire system. Intake staff should notify complainants of the manner in which their complaints have been resolved. Additionally, complaint analysts, who spend much of their time on the telephone, should be provided with additional training in mediation and dispute resolution techniques.

The agency should also ensure that appropriate cases involving lesser misconduct are addressed through the diversion and alternatives to discipline program. Currently, the alternatives to discipline programs operate within the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. They include the ethics school, trust accounting school, law office management assistance, mandatory continuing legal education in ethics and substance abuse programs. Agreements in lieu of discipline are used to refer lawyers to the program before and after the filing of a notice of disciplinary charges. There is a statutory mandate for the State Bar to create and implement these programs. As discussed in more detail in Recommendation 17 below, it is preferable for the State Bar to bring its resources and expertise to the operation of the alternatives to discipline program, as noted in the McKay Report. Members of the State Bar indicated a willingness to develop new programs and enhance existing ones to help lawyers and the public. Prompt referral of appropriate cases to a diversion/alternatives to discipline program operated by the State Bar rather than one operated by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel permits the disciplinary agency to devote its resources to the prompt investigation and prosecution of serious cases.

In Los Angeles, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel is structured on a horizontal model with the exception of the Specialty Prosecutions Unit. This means that investigations are conducted by staff in the General Investigations Unit after referral from the Intake Unit; the General Trials Unit prosecutes cases before the State Bar Court. According to information provided during interviews, investigators in the General Investigation Unit act independently, although they are supervised by lawyers. After a decision is made to file formal disciplinary charges, the case is transferred to the General Trials Unit. There, a new lawyer, with paralegal support, undertakes responsibility for the prosecution of the matter. There are no investigators in the General Trials Unit. In contrast, the Specialty Prosecutions Unit is structured vertically to investigate and prosecute cases. The

investigators and lawyers in that Unit work together closely and are involved in the case from commencement to conclusion.

The consultation team was told that the managers in the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel decided that the use of a horizontal structure was necessary to address the volume of pending matters and to engender teamwork and trust among the staff. The consultation team was told that the goal is to file matters before the State Bar Court as quickly as possible and to use liberal amendment rules and discovery to fine tune if needed.

However, the team was advised by various sources that the horizontal system does not, as planned, foster as effective an atmosphere of teamwork as the vertical system used by the Specialty Prosecutions Unit. The team was also informed of instances where the lawyers in the General Trials Unit had to spend time conducting additional investigation after the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. To do so, they had to utilize the investigators in the General Investigations Unit. In some instances they had to alter the theory of the case or amend pleadings as a result of the additional investigation. While the team understands the volume driven nature of the work of the disciplinary agency, the team thinks that discovery and pleading rules should not be used as a substitute for complete and thorough investigations.

The vertical prosecution model used by the Specialty Prosecution Unit seems to be working well. It has resulted in greater efficiency and more comprehensive case preparation, as well as increased staff morale. The need for lawyers in the General Trials Unit to conduct additional investigation or rework the theory of the case wastes time and creates a perception of unfairness by complainants and respondents. Lawyers assigned to investigate cases should also be responsible for the trial of those matters. Investigators assigned to assist these lawyers should work together closely with the lawyers supervising the investigative plan for the case. With appropriate staffing levels, as evidenced by the Specialty Prosecutions Unit, the vertical model of case processing can result in greater consistency and the timely disposition of matters. The team suggests that, once the backlog is eliminated and the staff gains more experience, the Chief Trial Counsel consider expanding this verticalization of prosecutions. He/she may do so by creating an additional specialized unit from existing staff to investigate and prosecute cases of minor misconduct that are not appropriate for referral to the alternatives to discipline program.

The probation monitoring program should also be adequately funded and staffed. The team was advised that lawyers in the Intake Unit are currently charged with supervising lawyers who have been placed on disciplinary probation. Sufficient resources are necessary for probation to be successful as a sanction and for monitoring to determine if it should be revoked.

Recommendation 3: All Staff and Volunteers of the Lawyer Discipline System Should Continue to Receive Appropriate Training

Commentary

Everyone involved in the lawyer disciplinary system should receive appropriate and continuous training. This is particularly important given the number of new staff hired since the shutdown in 1998. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel already has a well developed training program to educate new and existing employees about the nature and operation of the system, the State Bar Act and the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, the workings of the State Bar Court and applicable case law. New staff members are required to attend the ethics school. The system's appellate lawyers conduct monthly sessions regarding the evidentiary rules, and they circulate a newsletter containing recent decisions in the area of disciplinary and professional responsibility law. Detailed training outlines exist as well.

There are, however, areas related to training that the consultation team believes could be improved. For example, the complaint analysts in the Intake Unit should receive more formalized training. The team was advised that telephone training for the complaint analysts, who are not lawyers, consists mostly of their listening to more experienced analysts field inquiries. After approximately two weeks of listening, the new complaint analysts begin taking calls with the oversight of a supervisor. They receive some mediation training and are required to attend the ethics school.

Those interviewed agreed that enhanced service is needed at the intake level because this is the first, and likely only, contact the public may have with the discipline system. As a result, training for complaint analysts should include formal mediation training and courses in public relations. Since the complaint analysts also conduct minimal investigation into complaints, they should be trained how to elicit necessary information from complainants, respondents and other witnesses. The complaint analysts should also be trained to expeditiously recognize matters that should be referred to the alternatives to discipline program.

The team also received information that indicated that training for lawyers who are new to the system should be expanded. For example, new lawyers should be trained about their role in the system and how to comport themselves with opposing counsel, in addition to receiving training about the rules and procedures. Since many of the new lawyers hired by the agency after the 1998 shutdown are recent graduates with little law firm experience, training should include time spent with private practitioners, including respondents' counsel, to familiarize them with the operation and demands of private practice. It may be helpful to require all staff lawyers to enroll in courses offered by organizations like the National Institute of Trial Advocacy (NITA). They should include courses in settlement negotiations and deposition practice, in addition to courses in trial practice.

Investigators should receive additional training designed to enhance their abilities to conduct thorough, yet expeditious inquiries. This may include courses offered by law enforcement agencies, or courses designed to enhance their use of technology in the gathering of information.

Recommendation 4: Appropriate Resources Should Be Devoted to Enhance Public Access and Confidence in the California Lawyer Discipline System

Commentary

The State Bar of California and the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel produce pamphlets and other publications about the disciplinary system and related services offered by those entities. The State Bar's Website and the Intake Unit's telephone tree provide an abundance of information about the disciplinary process and other State Bar programs. The State Bar's Website also allows members and the public to access disciplinary information relating to California lawyers. California was one of the first states in the nation to make this type of information available on the internet. The content on the State Bar's Website is excellent, and the site is very user friendly. The State Bar updates the information regularly. The team believes that the disciplinary agency and/or the State Bar should increase efforts to publicize the availability of disciplinary and other information about the discipline system on the State Bar's Website.

Given the impact of the shut down on the disciplinary system, it is particularly important that the public and the bar have current information about the state of the system and the level at which its current programs are operating. The team received information which indicated that, due to frequent changes to the disciplinary procedural rules and in the implementation of the priorities for handling cases, many lawyers do not understand how the system currently operates, or where to find all of the applicable procedural and conduct rules (See Recommendation 16 below). As a result, the consultation team believes that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel and the State Bar should increase their efforts to better educate the public and the bar about the disciplinary process. This would include the publication and dissemination of additional brochures and pamphlets about the system in locations frequented by the public, such as courthouses, public libraries and other governmental offices. The disciplinary agency should resume its regular meetings with the respondent's bar, and representatives from the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel should speak to local bar associations about the process. The system's adjudicators should hold bench/bar conferences to talk about matters of general importance such as how the tribunal operates, what is expected of lawyers who appear there and what can be done to make the system more efficient.

Lawyers associated with the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel and the regulatory court judges should also speak to the public and law students about the lawyer disciplinary system. In other states, lawyers and supreme court justices attend meetings of organizations such as the League of Women Voters and Rotary Clubs to speak about the discipline system and the justice system as a whole. Other jurisdictions have produced video tapes that are available for public viewing at libraries and at law schools.

Another important way to educate the public about the system relates to the information contained in letters explaining to complainants why the agency dismissed their

complaints. Section 6093.5 of the Business & Professions Code, requires the agency, upon request, to notify complainants of the status of their case and to provide them with a written summary of the respondent's response if that correspondence was the reason the complaint was dismissed. Section 6093.5 further states that a "complainant shall be notified in writing of the disposition of his or her complaint, and of the reasons for the disposition." The team was advised of and noted during a review of files, instances where complainants had not been notified in writing of the disposition of their grievances or the reasons for the disposition. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel should always provide complainants with notice that their complaints have been dismissed. That notice should include an explanation of the reasons for the dismissal and the manner in which complainants can request reconsideration of the dismissal.

Additionally, the agency should consider providing complainants with copies of the respondent's response to the grievance **prior** to the dismissal of the matter. Providing them with a summary of the response after the case has been dismissed deprives complainants of an opportunity to fully respond to the lawyer. Further, while having that information summarized by the disciplinary office may be more cost effective, complainants may be able to respond more completely and effectively if provided with the actual document(s) submitted by the respondent.

PROCEDURES

Recommendation 5: The Rules Relating to Resignations With Charges Pending Should Be Repealed

Commentary

Rule 960 of the California Rules of Court provides that a member of the State Bar who is subject to disciplinary charges may submit a written resignation from State Bar membership and the right to practice law. Upon the filing of the resignation, a lawyer agrees to be placed immediately on inactive status. The contents of the resignation must note that there are charges pending against the lawyer and include a statement that, if the resignation is accepted by the Court and the lawyer applies for reinstatement, the State Bar can consider all disciplinary matters pending at the time of the resignation. The resignation also includes a statement by the lawyer that he or she will comply with the rules relating to the duties of disbarred, resigned or suspended attorneys.

Lawyers who resign from the practice of law with charges pending are not required to make any form of admission of culpability to the pending charges. The disciplinary agency receives a copy of the resignation and submits a recommendation to the Court as to whether it should accept the resignation. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel may, pursuant to Rule 651 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, perpetuate testimony or documentary evidence relating to the conduct of the lawyer if that evidence is relevant to any future inquiries into the lawyer's conduct. The lawyer who submits the resignation may not perpetuate testimony except upon order of the Court for good cause shown. Rule 653 (b), Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California.

The rules relating to resignations with charges pending should be repealed. Respondents should not be able to resign their law license as a result of pending investigations or charges without an admission of culpability or the imposition of a disciplinary sanction. Where a lawyer agrees to withdraw from the practice of law, his/her action should be treated as consensual disbarment, not resignation. This has been ABA policy since 1970 and is consistent with national practice. As noted in the Standard 11.1 of the 1979 ABA *Standards for Lawyer Discipline and Disability Proceedings* and its Comment:

1.1 Admission of Charges Required. A respondent should not be able to consent to being disciplined while a disciplinary proceeding is pending against him unless he admits in writing the truth of the charges that are the subject of the proceeding.

The respondent should be required to admit the charges before discipline is stipulated, so that evidence of guilt will be available if he later claims that he was not, in fact, guilty. Petitions for reinstatement are often filed years after discipline has been imposed, and if there is no admission it may be difficult for the agency

to establish the misconduct because relevant evidence and witnesses may no longer be available.

Rules 133 and 135 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California provide for stipulated dispositions of matters by the parties. These Rules provide the necessary safeguards for the public that Rule 960 of the California Rules of Court does not—an admission by the respondent that the facts and/or conclusions of law relating to the alleged misconduct are true. Stipulated dispositions allow for the entire range of sanctions to be imposed pursuant to an agreement between the parties, subject to approval by the State Bar Court and, in cases of suspension or disbarment, by the Supreme Court of California. The team believes that lawyers who agree to discipline on consent pursuant to the stipulation rules should be required to verify or execute an affidavit acknowledging that the facts alleged are true and that they are entering into the agreement voluntarily with full knowledge of the consequences. Currently they are only required to provide an unverified general statement to this effect and the case must be redeveloped during a reinstatement proceeding, long after the misconduct has taken place. The affidavit containing the admission should be used during the reinstatement/readmission process. MRLDE 21 and comment. Additionally, the lawyer should be required to notify his/her clients, opposing counsel and the courts of the agreed discipline imposed, consistent with the requirements of Rule 955 of the California Rules of Court. As noted above, lawyers who are now able to resign with charges pending are required to comply with Rule 955.

Recommendation 6: The Default Process Should Be Clarified and Streamlined

Commentary

The team was advised that currently, default occurs in approximately 35-40% of the cases in which lawyers are charged with misconduct. Section 6007 (e) of the Business and Professions Code sets forth general conditions under which a lawyer can be placed on involuntary inactive enrollment due to default. Specifically, there must be proper service of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges pursuant to Section 6002.1 of the Code, and the beginning of the Notice must contain specific language regarding when a default will be entered, in all capital letters. Section 6007 (e) (3) further states that placing a defaulting lawyer on involuntary inactive enrollment is administrative in nature and that no hearing is required.

Rules 101 and 200 – 210 of The Rules of Procedure for the State Bar Court expand upon the requirements of Section 6007, and set forth a lengthy and at times seemingly conflicting default procedure. For example, Rule 101 provides the language regarding default that must appear in all capital letters at or near the beginning of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges. Specifically, it says that:

“IF YOU FAIL TO FILE AN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN THE TIME ALLOWED BY STATE BAR RULES, INCLUDING EXTENSIONS, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL, (1) YOUR DEFAULT **SHALL** (emphasis added) BE ENTERED, (2) YOU SHALL BE ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR...”

The use of the word “shall” in the default warning indicates that the entry of default is automatic if the conditions are met. However, Rule 103 (d), which relates to responses to Notices of Disciplinary Charges, provides that the Deputy Trial Counsel **may** elect to proceed by default if an answer is not timely filed. This would seem to indicate that the entry of default is not automatic. The rules should be consistent. The team suggests that the language in the Notice be amended to substitute the word “may” for “shall”, or that Rule 103 be amended to require the Deputy Trial Counsel to file a motion for default and to deem the allegations of the Notice admitted.

Rule 200 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California is entitled “Default Procedure for Failure to Timely File Response.” The Rule sets forth the information that must be included in the Deputy Trial Counsel’s motion for entry of an order of default. That motion must include language in prominent type informing the respondent that he or she has ten days from the time of service of the motion to respond to it. If no response is received, the Rule provides that the default will be entered, the factual allegations will be deemed admitted, otherwise inadmissible evidence can be used against the respondent, and the respondent will lose the opportunity to further participate in the proceedings.

If a respondent does not reply to the motion for default, the Clerk of the State Bar Court enters and serves on the respondent a Notice of Entry of Default. The respondent may timely move to vacate the default. Unless the default is vacated, Rule 200 (d) (1) provides that no further proof is required to establish the truth of the allegations in the Notice of Disciplinary Charges.

Rule 202 provides that, after the entry of an order of default, an expedited hearing shall be held at which the Deputy Trial Counsel may introduce "...any evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs...." The testimony of witnesses may be taken. Evidence at this hearing is not limited to that relating to factors in aggravation and/or mitigation. The Deputy Trial Counsel may submit written evidence with a request for waiver of hearing. It was not clear to the team how often this happens.

The team recommends that any hearings in default cases be limited to evidence of aggravation and mitigation, or that any additional documentary evidence be filed with the State Bar Court. The time spent taking additional evidence when the allegations of the complaint have been admitted, except in the most extreme circumstances, would seem unnecessary. State Bar Court judges issue full, written opinions in each default case. The team was advised that the Supreme Court wants opinions in default cases; however these opinions could be more concise.

Lawyers who default should be placed on involuntary inactive enrollment status within a short period of time after they fail to file an answer to the Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The team was also advised that in many instances these lawyers receive low level discipline at the conclusion of the default proceedings. Lawyers who do not participate in the proceedings and who are found to be in default should ultimately be suspended and required to petition for reinstatement. A default process resulting in low level discipline routinely results in recidivism and causes an unnecessary waste of resources. The team was advised of instances where staff lawyers had to bring additional charges against lawyers who had previously defaulted.

Recommendation 7: The Decision Whether to Disclose Otherwise Confidential Information In Designated Circumstances Should Rest Solely With the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel

Commentary

Consistent with national practice, disciplinary proceedings in California are confidential until the filing of formal charges. However, Section 6086.1 of the Business and Professions Code provides that the Chief Trial Counsel or the President of the State Bar may waive confidentiality when warranted for the protection of the public. Rule 2302 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California provides examples of specific instances where such disclosure may occur. Disclosure is not limited to those instances.

While the team agrees with the rationale for waiver of confidentiality to protect the public, it believes that only the Chief Trial Counsel should have that power under specified circumstances. MRLDE 16 (B) and Comment. The Rule and State Bar Act should be amended accordingly to allow only the Chief Trial Counsel to disclose the pendency, subject matter and status of an investigation under these circumstances.

The election to the office of President of the State Bar is, by its nature, political. Each person to hold the office has a different personality, comes from a different background and has different goals for the State Bar and the discipline system. Placing this power with the President of the State Bar creates an unnecessary risk that the public and respondents will perceive any disclosure by the President as politically motivated. The President of the State Bar should not be involved in or provided with details about the specifics of confidential investigations. To do so creates the appearance of conflicts of interest or impropriety. While the team was presented with no evidence that any State Bar President has abused this power, it feels that the risk of such interference and consequent damage to public perception of the system as independent and fair is reason enough to modify the rules.

The Chief Trial Counsel, as the head of the disciplinary agency is the appropriate person in whom to vest with this power. He or she is specifically empowered to investigate and prosecute allegations of misconduct and has the expertise in the area of disciplinary law to impartially assess all the information necessary to make that decision. Under the system proposed in Recommendation One above, the Court would appoint the Chief Trial Counsel or its new oversight entity would make the choice with Court approval. This process would further ensure the independence of the individual who determines whether to waive the confidentiality rules in order to protect the public.

Recommendation 8: The Use of Early Neutral Evaluation Conferences to Expedite the Resolution of Matters Should Continue With Some Modifications

Commentary

If after investigation, a Deputy Trial Counsel determines there is sufficient evidence to proceed with a Notice of Disciplinary Charges, the Deputy Trial Counsel also conducts pre-filing settlement discussions. At this point in the process, either party may request an Early Neutral Evaluation Conference (ENEC). Pursuant to Rule 75 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, a State Bar Court judge conducts the ENEC if the parties are unable to reach an agreed disposition prior to the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The State Bar Court judge is to hold the ENEC within 15 days of either party's request. The team was advised that it takes longer to schedule and hold the ENEC. Once an ENEC is requested, steps should be taken to ensure its prompt scheduling.

The ENEC judge provides the parties with a neutral evaluation of the merits of the case and the likelihood that discipline will be imposed if the matter proceeds to trial. The Deputy Trial Counsel provides the ENEC judge with a draft of the Notice of Disciplinary Charges along with any other evidence supporting the allegations. The respondent may provide documents to the ENEC judge as well. Both sides may designate documents as confidential to be examined by the ENEC judge *in camera*. If the matter can be resolved as a result of an ENEC, the Deputy Trial Counsel is required to document the resolution and the ENEC judge may approve or reject the proposed agreement. Additional ENECs may be ordered by the judge. A judge who participates in an ENEC cannot act as the trial judge in the same matter.

All of those interviewed spoke highly of the ENECs. The team agrees that they are useful and assist in expediting the resolution of matters. They should be continued, but steps should be taken to ensure that the ENECs are not used to delay the processing of cases. Neither party, the General Investigation Unit in particular, should use the ENECs to conduct additional investigation. Respondents should not be able to withhold information from the agency until the initial ENEC. The use of the ENECs for this purpose creates delay, because in fairness to all involved, the judge will likely grant time for the parties to consider the newly gained information and schedule a new ENEC. The team was advised that this does happen. The team was also told that in a notable number of cases the ENEC constitutes the first opportunity for disciplinary counsel to obtain information from a respondent. This should not be the case.

The General Investigation Unit has the ability to subpoena witnesses to provide testimony during the course of the investigation. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6049, Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, Rule 2502. Those who do not comply with the subpoenas are subject to contempt proceedings. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6050. Information provided to the consultation team indicated that in the Los Angeles office there are a number of cases where the respondent has not provided information to the investigators

in response to inquiries. Despite the nonresponse, the use of investigative subpoenas to elicit a response is minimal. Deputy Trial Counsel in the General Investigation Unit should exercise the subpoena power to compel recalcitrant respondents to provide information. Respondents have a duty to cooperate with the disciplinary agency, and they should be held to that duty. Further, the General Investigations Unit should proactively investigate its cases. Disciplinary counsel should continue to provide respondents with all unprivileged information in the file.

Recommendation 9: Rules 182 and 211 of The Rules of the State Bar of California Should Be Merged

Commentary

Rule 182 of the Rules of Procedure for the State Bar of California states that within twenty days after a respondent files a responsive pleading in a matter where discovery can proceed without court order, the parties must have a discovery conference. At this discovery conference, where a State Bar Court judge is not present and no orders setting the parameters of discovery are issued, the parties are to attempt to reach agreement on the terms for informal discovery. This includes the exchange of documents and information about witnesses. The parties are also supposed to create a plan and timetable for the completion of formal discovery. The parties can stipulate, without leave of court, to one continuance of this conference, not to exceed thirty days from the date of service of the responsive pleading.

Rule 211 provides for the filing of pretrial statements and the conducting of pretrial conferences. That Rule states that pretrial conferences shall not be held more than 45 days before the trial date. At the pretrial conference, the judge rules on objections to the pretrial statements and may order the amendment of those statements.

In order to further streamline the disciplinary process, pretrial conferences should be regularly utilized to promote the timely disposition of cases. MRLDE 18(E). As a result, the team recommends that the requirements of Rules 182 and 211 be merged and expanded. Effective case management is vital to the fair and expeditious disposition of cases. A requirement that all pre-hearing conferences must be held before a judge should reduce actual delay, or the risk of delay by the parties. These formal pretrial conferences allow the parties and the judge to create a case management plan early in the process that is tailored to the unique nature and complexity of each case; less complex cases require less discovery and less time to prepare for trial. By recommending that all pretrial conferences must be held before a judge, the team does not intend to discourage the parties from communicating and cooperating with each other regarding discovery issues. They should continue to do so, and any agreements that they reach can be discussed and memorialized in the pretrial order issued at the pretrial conference.

The team recommends that the new Rule should provide that the initial pretrial conference is to be held within a short period of time (fifteen to twenty days) after the filing of an answer to a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The team believes that waiting until 45 days before trial is too long. All pretrial conferences can occur in person or by telephone and should be recorded by some means. At the initial pretrial conference the judge should issue an order setting forth the terms of discovery, deadlines for the filing and resolution of pretrial motions and stipulations regarding facts, documents and other evidence. Subsequent pretrial conferences should be held as necessary to ensure the expeditious progress of a case through the system. The parties should not have to wait for the initial pretrial conference to file formal requests for discovery. Rule 182 currently

requires the parties to wait until 20 days after the date the answer to the Notice of Disciplinary Charges is due.

The following may occur during each pretrial conference: (1) formulation and simplification of issues; (2) elimination of frivolous charges and defenses; (3) amendments to pleadings; (4) stipulations relating to facts and the admissibility of documents to eliminate unnecessary proof; (5) pre-trial rulings on the admissibility of evidence; (6) identification and limitation of occurrence, character and expert witnesses, including explanations of the subject matter of their proposed testimony; (7) limitations on discovery, including the setting of deadlines and limitations on the number and length of depositions; (8) the possibility of discipline on consent; and (9) any other matters that will aid in the prompt disposition of a matter. Subsequent to each pretrial conference, the judge should enter an order setting forth all actions that he/she has taken and reciting any agreements between the parties.

The routine use of pretrial conferences also creates opportunities for judges to obtain copies of undisputed documentary evidence in advance of trial so that they can familiarize themselves with that evidence before the commencement of the trial. This too saves time.

Recommendation 10: Procedures to Place Lawyers on Involuntary Inactive Enrollment for Threat of Harm Should Be Streamlined

Commentary

Sections 6007 (c) (1) through (4) of the Business and Professions Code sets forth the requirements for determining when a lawyer can be placed on involuntary inactive enrollment when that lawyer poses a substantial threat of harm to the lawyer's clients or the public. In order to determine that a lawyer's conduct poses such a substantial threat of harm, the State Bar Court judge must find that **each** of the following factors has been demonstrated based upon all available evidence: (1) the lawyer has caused or is causing substantial harm to clients or the public; (2) the lawyer's clients or the public is likely to suffer more harm from the denial of the involuntary inactive enrollment than the lawyer will suffer if it is granted, or there is a reasonable likelihood that the harm will reoccur or continue (where there is a pattern of misconduct by the lawyer, the burden of proof shifts to the lawyer to show there is no reasonable likelihood that the harm will reoccur or continue); and (3) there is a reasonable probability the State Bar will prevail on the merits of an underlying disciplinary case premised upon the misconduct. The statute further requires that these matters proceed on an expedited basis.

Rules 460 through 484 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California contain procedures to implement involuntary inactive enrollment proceedings pursuant to Section 6007 (c) (1) through (4). The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel initiates these proceedings by filing a verified application, with supporting documents, requesting that the lawyer in question be placed on involuntary inactive enrollment because he or she poses a substantial threat of harm to clients or the public. The application must set forth with specificity the facts relied upon by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel in support of the request, along with the identification of any pending investigations or disciplinary proceedings that involve the same occurrences. The application should also set forth the specific rules and/or statutes alleged to have been violated if that information is not already contained in a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel must serve the lawyer with a copy of the application within three days after filing. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel may request a hearing on the application, or a State Bar Court judge may order one if he or she deems it appropriate. Based upon the language of Rule 461, it appears that the Clerk of the State Bar Court automatically sets a hearing on an expedited basis.

Pursuant to Rule 462 a lawyer against whom such an application has been filed must respond to that pleading within ten days from the date of service and request that the hearing scheduled by the Clerk be held. If no response and request for hearing is filed the lawyer is deemed to have waived his or her right to the hearing. The lawyer may stipulate to the involuntary inactive enrollment as well. Rule 463 provides that any such stipulation must contain the factual basis thereof. However, it appears to the team that the lawyer does not appear to be required to include an admission of misconduct.

If the matter proceeds to hearing, Rule 464 provides that the State Bar Court judge conduct it in an expedited manner, with no interruptions or continuances except for good cause shown. Rule 465 states that the evidence to be entered at the hearing shall be in the form of documents, declarations, requests for judicial notice and transcripts. Live testimony and cross-examination is not permitted unless the judge determines that good cause has been shown by the requesting party. If the hearing is contested the judge must rule on the admissibility of the offered declarations. If no hearing is held, Rule 465 (c) provides that any declarations offered must contain probative facts and show the source of the declarant's information. Declarations based upon information and belief are insufficient proof of substantial harm.

Rule 466 requires the judge to file his or her decision no later than ten days after the conclusion of the hearing, or no later than ten days after the date set for hearing if no hearing is ultimately held. The decision of the court is effective upon personal service or three days after service by mail. The court's order must include a statement as to whether the lawyer received notice of the proceedings and that each of the factors set forth in Section 6007 (c) (2) has been met. Review of the decision whether to place a lawyer on involuntary inactive enrollment for threat of substantial harm may be based only upon error of law or abuse of discretion.

Section 6007 (c) (1) through (4) of the Business and Professions Code, and Rules 460 et. seq., should be amended to expedite and simplify the process. Information received by the team demonstrates that the current procedures and requirements are not adequately protective of the public and provide excessive due process to the respondent. Certain misconduct, such as ongoing conversion of client funds, poses such a substantial threat of serious harm to the public and the administration of justice that the **immediate suspension** of a lawyer's license pending final resolution of disciplinary proceedings is warranted. Most states provide for immediate interim suspension in these circumstances.

Any amendments to the current rules and statute should provide that, upon receipt of sufficient evidence demonstrating that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct and poses a substantial threat of serious harm to the public, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel should transmit that evidence to the regulatory court along with a proposed order for immediate involuntary inactive enrollment. MRLDE 20 and Comment. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel should contemporaneously attempt to provide the respondent with notice of the filing. This notice may include notice by telephone. MRLDE 20 and Comment. Upon examination of this evidence and any rebuttal evidence submitted by the respondent prior to the ruling, the court should, if appropriate, enter an order immediately placing the lawyer on involuntary inactive enrollment. All hearings on applications to place a lawyer on involuntary inactive enrollment should be eliminated. They permit a lawyer engaging in conduct constituting a substantial threat of serious harm to clients and/or the public to continue to engage in misconduct, under the guise of a valid law license, pending the hearing and issuance of the court's order. This is not protective of the public, nor does it enhance the integrity of the profession. This rule applies to extreme cases and the interests of clients and the public requires only necessary due process to the lawyer. Additionally, the only evidence

to be introduced at these hearings is documentary. This information can be appended to the application for involuntary inactive enrollment.

The entry of such an order without a hearing does not deprive the lawyer of due process. This procedure is similar to those applicable to civil temporary restraining orders, except they do not expire automatically. Additionally, a lawyer should be able to file a motion for dissolution of the court's order upon two day's notice to the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. Due process considerations require that a prompt post-suspension hearing on that motion be given to the lawyer.

The portion of the State Bar Act requiring the current State Bar Court to consider whether the lawyer's clients or the public are likely to suffer greater injury from the denial of the petition than the lawyer is likely to suffer if it is granted should be eliminated as well. The interests of clients and the public in cases like these are paramount to the potential harm to the lawyer engaging in such serious misconduct. The inclusion of this standard of proof in the existing rules creates a perception of protectionism that is damaging to the profession.

Recommendation 11: The Review Department of the State Bar Court Should Use a More Deferential Standard of Review

Commentary

Pursuant to Rule 951.5 of the California Rules of Court, the Review Department of the State Bar Court conducts a *de novo* review of the proceedings at the hearing level. The team recommends that the Supreme Court of California amend Rule 951.1 to provide for a more deferential standard of review. The Review Department of the State Bar Court should no longer consider appeals on a *de novo* basis. The team understands that the issue of amending the Rule to provide for a more deferential standard has been studied prior to the team's visit.

A more deferential standard of review should be adopted and used by the Court as well in its review of disciplinary matters. All information provided to the team indicates that the hearing judges conduct thorough, fair trials and write opinions with complete findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations for discipline. Given this, there seems to be no need for a *de novo* review by the appellate level, particularly with respect to findings of fact. The hearing judges are able to observe the witnesses' testimony and demeanor and are in the best position to assess their credibility. Unless there is evidence that their findings of fact are clearly erroneous, the factual determinations of the hearing judges should stand. With respect to conclusions of law and recommendations of discipline, unless the trial judges have acted arbitrarily, committed reversible error, incorrectly stated the law or abused their discretion, their findings should not be reversed. Further, given the completeness of the underlying findings, adopting a new, more deferential standard of review will not deprive the Supreme Court of a complete, full and fair disposition of the case for consideration.

Steps should also be taken to expedite the appeals process at that level. The team was advised that due to difficulties with court reporters, it can take up to six months to obtain a transcript. Information provided to the team also indicated that it can take as long as six months to schedule oral argument after the filing of briefs. The State Bar Court should ensure that the proceedings at the hearing level are transcribed promptly. Given the size of the caseload at the review level, it should not be difficult to eliminate the delay in scheduling oral arguments.

The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel should also handle disciplinary appeals before the California Supreme Court. Currently, the Office of the General Counsel of the State Bar handles those appeals. The staff of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has the expertise to handle these appeals. The team believes that lawyers from that Office, where the complaint has proceeded from investigation to prosecution, are in the best position to brief and argue a disciplinary matter before the Court. Further, allowing the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel to brief and argue these matters would eliminate any perception of conflict of interest or impropriety that might arise when the case is transferred out of the disciplinary agency to the State Bar.

Recommendation 12: Lawyers Petitioning For Reinstatement Should Be Responsible For the Costs of Those Proceedings

Commentary

Sections 6086.10 and 6140.7 of the Business and Professions Code together generally provide that the costs of disciplinary proceedings resulting in the imposition of discipline by the Court, including resignations with charges pending, shall be paid by the disciplined lawyer as a condition of reinstatement. The State Bar Act does not provide for the recoupment by the disciplinary agency of the costs associated with reinstatements. Currently, petitioners are required to pay a \$900 reinstatement fee to the State Bar Court. None of those monies are received by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel to offset the investigation and defense of petitions for reinstatement.

Nationwide, the investigation of petitions for reinstatement is extremely time and resource intensive. The number of lawyers who apply for and actually are granted reinstatement is low. In many instances where disbarment or suspension was on consent, or in California in cases of resignations with charges pending that do not contain admissions of the facts, disciplinary counsel must reinvestigate the underlying misconduct in addition to information relating to the petitioner's current fitness to practice law.

Disciplined lawyers must be required to pay the costs of the proceedings that led to their discipline. They bear the burden of proving in a reinstatement proceeding their fitness to practice law. As part of this burden they should be required to pay for the reasonable costs of reinstatement proceedings. This would include reimbursing the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel for reasonable costs associated with the investigation and defense of the petition for reinstatement. The \$900 deposit now paid to the State Bar Court should be used for this purpose.

Recommendation 13: Section 6043.5 of the Business and Professions Code Should Be Repealed

Commentary

Section 6043.5 of the Business and Professions Code states that “[E]very person who reports to the State Bar or causes a complaint to be filed with the State Bar that an attorney has engaged in professional misconduct, knowing the report to be false and malicious is guilty of a misdemeanor.” The State Bar may, in its discretion, report such complainants to the District Attorney’s office with a recommendation for prosecution.

This statute should be repealed. Complainants should not be subject to the threat of criminal prosecution or civil liability for the filing of a complaint with the disciplinary agency. It is vital to the integrity of the disciplinary process that complainants be permitted to freely file their grievances. The individual lawyer may suffer some hardship as the result of the filing of a malicious complaint, but a profession that wants to preserve the power to police its own members must be willing to make some sacrifice. The damage to the public’s perception of the profession by permitting the prosecution of complainants is far greater. The public must have confidence that the legal profession will not only consider, but actively seek out information about unethical lawyers and protect from threats those who provide that information.

The disciplinary process in California provides for confidentiality until the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges. The investigation of allegations of misconduct is confidential. This provides a significant layer of protection for lawyers against false and malicious complaints becoming public. The professional staff of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel provides additional protection. It is their job to screen the meritorious complaints from those that have no merit or are filed to harass a lawyer. As a result, it is highly unlikely that any false or malicious complaint will become public, and the most likely damage to the lawyer will be the inconvenience of having to respond to the complaint with the protection of confidentiality. In fact, lawyers who have complaints filed against them are provided greater protection from public disclosure than a party to an ordinary civil action.

Complainants should be provided with absolute immunity for any communications made to the disciplinary agency. MRLDE 12 and Comment. All but perhaps two or three jurisdictions confer either absolute or qualified immunity on complainants for their communications with the agency. For the lawyer disciplinary system to be effective, complainants must be free to report possible lawyer misconduct. Absolute immunity does not protect complainants who commit perjury or who make slanderous statements outside the disciplinary proceedings.

Recommendation 14: Complainants Should Be Kept Fully Apprised of the Status of Their Complaints and Should Be Provided a Mechanism For Reconsideration of the Dismissal of Their Grievances

Commentary

As noted in Recommendation 4 above, Section 6093.5 of the Business & Professions Code, requires the agency, upon request, to notify complainants of the status of their cases and to provide the complainant with a written summary of the respondent's response if that correspondence was the reason the complaint was dismissed. That Section further states that a "complainant shall be notified in writing of the disposition of his or her complaint, and of the reasons for the disposition." Written notice should also be provided to complainants where lawyers against whom they have complained receive private discipline.

Information gathered by the team showed that complainants were not always provided with this information. While the team understands that the difficulties of dealing with the increased inventory of pending cases may have resulted in the failure to do so in all instances, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel should ensure that complainants are always provided with notice that their complaints have been dismissed. That notice should include an explanation of the reasons for the dismissal and the manner in which complainants can request reconsideration of the dismissal. Previously, the Discipline Audit Panel, formerly the Complainants' Grievance Panel, provided a mechanism for reviewing dismissals by the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. Bus. & Prof. Code, Sec. 6086.11. Section 6086.11 and all corresponding Rules of Procedure for the State Bar of California were repealed in January 2000.

The team does not recommend reinstating the Discipline Audit Panel, along with the resources that would be needed for its operation. However, complainants should be able to request the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel to reconsider the dismissal of their grievances. The team believes that Rule 2603 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California offers an appropriate vehicle for creating such a mechanism. That Rule provides the Office of the Chief the Chief Trial Counsel with the authority to reopen an investigation upon the receipt of new material evidence, or if there is good cause to do so. The Rule could be amended to state that complainants who believe that their complaints were wrongly dismissed may ask the Chief Trial Counsel or a designated Assistant or Deputy Chief Trial Counsel, to reconsider that decision. If the complainant provides additional material evidence in support of their complaint, or the reviewing lawyer deems it appropriate, the investigation can be reopened. If the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel denies the complainant's request for reconsideration, then the matter should proceed no further and the complainant should be so advised.

In addition to providing a detailed explanation of the dismissal, closure letters sent to complainants should include direction for requesting reconsideration of that decision and

note the circumstances under which such a request can be granted. In many instances complainants request reconsideration of their grievances because they are not told or do not understand why their complaint was dismissed. The inclusion of this information should result in a decrease in the number of complainants requesting reconsideration of dismissed complaints.

Recommendation 15: The Use of the Vague Term “Moral Turpitude” Should Be Eliminated From the Statutes and Rules Relating to Lawyer Conduct and Discipline

Commentary

Throughout the State Bar Act and the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, reference is made to conduct involving moral turpitude. For example, Sections 6068(5), 6101 and 6102 of the Business and Professions Code refer to disciplinary procedures for lawyers convicted of crimes of moral turpitude. Rules 600 through 608 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California relate to Sections 6101 and 6012. Section 6106 of the Business and Professions Code provides that the commission by a lawyer of any act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption, regardless of the context in which the act is committed, is cause for disbarment or suspension. The *Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct* also refer to misconduct involving moral turpitude.

The use of the term “moral turpitude” should be eliminated from the statutes and rules relating to lawyer conduct and discipline. As stated in the Comment to Rule 8.4 of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct,

[1] Many kinds of illegal conduct reflect adversely on fitness to practice law, such as offenses involving fraud and the offense of willful failure to file an income tax return. However, some kinds of offense carry no such implication. Traditionally, the distinction was drawn in terms of offenses involving “moral turpitude.” That concept can be construed to include offenses concerning some matters of personal morality, such as adultery and comparable offenses, that have no specific connection to fitness for the practice of law. Although a lawyer is personally answerable to the entire criminal law, a lawyer should be professionally answerable only for offenses that indicate lack of those characteristics relevant to law practice. Offenses involving violence, dishonesty, breach of trust, or serious interference with the administration of justice are in that category. A pattern of repeated offenses, even ones of minor significance when considered separately, can indicate indifference to legal obligation.

The term “moral turpitude” was not included in the ABA *Model Rules of Professional Conduct* when they were adopted by the ABA House of Delegates in 1983. The term had been included in the predecessor ABA *Model Code of Professional Conduct*. While not considered unconstitutionally vague, the range of conduct that might fall under the definition of the term “moral turpitude” is subjective. The ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct reject the concept of “moral turpitude.” The vast array of acts that may fall under that rubric do not necessarily relate to a lawyer’s fitness to practice law. Instead, the Rules focus on criminal acts that reflect adversely on a lawyer’s “...honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects.” ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 8.4 (b).

The ABA Model Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement relating to convictions also omit mention of crimes involving moral turpitude, instead referring to “serious crimes.” MRLDE 19 and Terminology. A serious crime is “any felony or any lesser crime that reflects adversely on the lawyer’s honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer in other respects, or any crime a necessary element of which, as determined by the statutory or common law definition of the crime, involves interference with the administration of justice, false swearing, misrepresentation, fraud, deceit, bribery, extortion, misappropriation, theft, or an attempt, conspiracy or solicitation of another to commit a “serious crime.” MRLDE 19. The team recommends that relevant sections of the State Bar Act and the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California be amended to eliminate the term “moral turpitude” and replace it with the term “serious crime” as defined above.

The team also suggests that the Rules and Statutes be amended to provide for the immediate interim suspension of a lawyer **found guilty** but not yet convicted of a serious crime. Under Section 6102, the Supreme Court of California currently issues such a suspension upon conviction of a felony or crime involving moral turpitude. Continued practice by a lawyer found guilty of a “serious crime” undermines public confidence in the profession and the administration of justice. Because there may be delay between a determination of guilt and the entry of a judgment of conviction, the Court should enter an order of interim suspension upon the finding of guilt. It is difficult for the public to understand why a lawyer found guilty of stealing funds from a client can continue to handle client funds, why a lawyer found guilty of securities fraud can continue to prepare and certify registration statements, or why a lawyer found guilty of conspiracy to suborn perjury can continue to try cases and present witnesses. Immediate suspension of a lawyer found guilty of such a crime, regardless of the pendency of any appeal, is essential to preserve public confidence. The Court should continue to use convictions as the basis for summary disbarment.

Recommendation 16: The Rules Governing Lawyer Conduct and Disciplinary Proceedings Should Be Compiled In a More User Friendly Manner

Commentary

The Supreme Court should appoint a task force to revise and compile in one comprehensive and comprehensible document all of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Currently, the conduct rules are interspersed in the Rules of Professional Conduct, the State Bar Act and related statutes. Requiring California lawyers to search various locations for the relevant rules governing their conduct is confusing and constitutes a disservice to the bar. Additionally, having the conduct rules located in one document will help ensure consistency and eliminate the danger of conflicting rules and statutes. This document should be published together with the procedural rules that relate to the discipline system. Superseded rules or statutes should be published, if at all, after the current rule instead of before it. Given the volume of conduct rules in California, the team recommends that superseded rules not be published with the current rules.

ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

Recommendation 17: The Existing Alternatives to Discipline Program Should Be Enhanced and Moved to the State and Local Bars

Commentary

In California, as in the rest of the country, the majority of complaints made against lawyers allege instances of lesser misconduct. Single instances of minor neglect or minor incompetence, while technically violations of the rules of professional conduct, are seldom treated as such. These cases rarely justify the resources needed to conduct formal disciplinary proceedings, nor do they justify the imposition of a disciplinary sanction. These types of complaints are almost always dismissed by the disciplinary agency. Summary dismissal of these complaints is one of the chief sources of public dissatisfaction with disciplinary systems. The agency should ensure that appropriate cases involving lesser misconduct are addressed through the diversion and alternatives to discipline program.

Section 6086.14 of the Business and Professions Code authorizes the State Bar to establish such a program to resolve complaints against lawyers that do not warrant investigation or prosecution. Rules 4401 through 4407 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California set forth procedures for referral to the program. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has developed internal procedures and guidelines for the program. The team was also provided with a draft of a proposed statute relating to the establishment of a diversion program for lawyers suffering from substance abuse and/or mental health problems.

Currently, the alternatives to discipline programs operate within the State Bar and the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. They include the ethics school, trust accounting school, law office management assistance, mandatory continuing legal education in ethics and substance abuse programs. Some local bar associations conduct mediation of lawyer-client disputes. Agreements in lieu of discipline are used to refer lawyers to such programs before and after the filing of notices of disciplinary charges.

The disciplinary agency should devote its resources to the investigation and prosecution of disciplinary complaints and continue working toward successful reduction of the post-shut down inventory of pending cases. While it should refer cases to the alternatives to discipline program and receive reports regarding the compliance of lawyers with the terms of agreements to enter these programs, the agency should be removed from the operation of most of those initiatives. The team believes that the State Bar and local bar associations should bring their resources and expertise to the operation of alternatives to discipline programs, as recommended in the McKay Report. This type of involvement in the regulatory process by the organized bar reflects positively on the profession. By

assisting lawyers whose conduct and/or practices are questionable but not worthy of formal prosecution, the bar helps lawyers and the public.

The alternatives to discipline program should be enhanced to include a sufficient variety of programs to address the specific areas of need demonstrated by lawyers referred from the disciplinary agency. The Office of the Trial Counsel may wish to continue to operate the ethics school and should explore new and creative ways to conduct the program. For example, members of the respondents' bar, State Bar Court judges and ethicists should be invited to teach portions of the class. The Office may wish to recruit previously disciplined lawyers to talk to participants. The Office might explore utilizing a program similar to National Institute of Trial Advocacy to educate participants about they ways to correctly handle situations that implicate the Rules of Professional Conduct.

SANCTIONS

Recommendation 18: The Issuance of Private Reprovals After the Filing of Formal Charges and Admonitions Should Be Eliminated

Commentary

Pursuant to Rule 270 of the Rules and Procedures of the State Bar of California, the State Bar Court may issued a private or public reproof after the initiation of proceedings before that tribunal. A private reproof issued at this time becomes part of the lawyer's disciplinary record, is disclosed in response to public inquiries and reported as a record of public discipline on the State Bar's web site. A private reproof issued before the commencement of State Bar Court proceedings is not disclosed in response to public inquiries and does not appear on the State Bar's web site. The records of proceedings in which the private reproof was issued in these cases are not available to the public.

The team recommends that the imposition of private reproof **after** the filing of a Notice of Disciplinary Charges or initiation of other State Bar Court proceedings should be eliminated. There should not be private discipline after the filing of public charges. The imposition of a private sanction after the filing of public charges adversely impacts the public's perception of the disciplinary process. MRLDE 10 and Comment. The existence of a private sanction that can be issued subsequent to any proceeding on formal charges fosters distrust of the system. Additionally, based upon the language of Rule 270, private reprovals of this type are not really private. As a result, it makes no sense to maintain that they are.

The team also recommends that admonitions be eliminated. Rule 264 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California provides for the issuance of admonitions. They are not considered to be discipline and the respondent must consent to their imposition. According to information provided to the team, they are no longer used for these reasons. If a lawyer is found to have committed lesser misconduct that has caused little or no harm and is unlikely to be repeated, a private reproof may be appropriate as well as referral to the alternatives to discipline program.

Recommendation 19: The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Conduct Should Be Updated

Commentary

According to information provided to the team, the Board of Governors of the State Bar made revisions to the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Conduct, effective January 1, 2001, that eliminated out of date references to rules and statutes. State Bar Court staff is currently reviewing the Standards, with the intent of making substantive updates. The Office of the Chief Trial Counsel is involved in this process. Had such a review not already been underway, the team was going to recommend one. The team believes that necessary revisions should be made and submitted for adoption by the Supreme Court. All disciplinary counsel and disciplinary court judges should receive training as to how to use the Standards. Disciplinary counsel, especially new counsel, should be required to follow the Standards and existing precedent in formulating sanction recommendations.

As noted in Recommendation 15 above, the team believes that the term “moral turpitude” should be deleted from the rules relating to the discipline and conduct of lawyers. Additionally, consistent with Recommendation 6, the minimum sanction for default cases should be a form of suspension that requires reinstatement. The imposition of lesser sanctions in default cases is likely to result in recidivism.

CONCLUSION

As noted throughout this Report, the consultation team was impressed by the dedication of the Court, the past and current staff of the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel, the judges and staff of the State Bar Court, all of the volunteers in the system, and the members and leadership of the State Bar of California. The desire of the system's professionals and volunteers to achieve continued improvements in the system is notable. The team hopes that the recommendations contained in this Report will assist the Court in the implementation of any desired changes.

As part of the discipline system consultation program, the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline will make its members available for further consultation with the Court. Additionally, the Joint Committee on Lawyer Regulation stands ready to assist the Court, the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel and the State Bar of California with the expansion of its Alternatives to Discipline Program.

JOHN T. BERRY is the Executive Director of the State Bar of Michigan. He has formerly served as Director of the Center of Professionalism at the University of Florida, Levin College of Law, as the Assistant Executive Director of the Legal Division for the State Bar of Arizona and as the Director of the Legal Division of the State Bar of Florida, where he oversaw the operation and management of these jurisdiction's lawyer discipline systems.

Mr. Berry is a past President of the National Organization of Bar Counsel and served as its Delegate in the ABA House of Delegates. He served on the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline and was a member of the ABA Commission on Evaluation of Disciplinary Enforcement. Mr. Berry He has lectured throughout the United States on the topic of lawyer regulation and ethics, and has served as an advisor to the Florida House of Representatives Select Committee on establishing disciplinary procedures for charges brought against House members.

THOMAS A. DECKER is a Senior Member and Managing Partner in the Philadelphia office of Cozen and O'Connor. Prior to joining Cozen and O'Connor, he was the Executive Vice President and General Counsel of Asbury Automotive Group. Prior to joining Asbury, Mr. Decker was Senior Vice President and General Counsel of Unisource Worldwide, Inc. (1997-1999). He previously was Executive Vice President, Chief Operating Officer and General Counsel of Saint-Gobain Corporation (1974-1997). (Saint-Gobain operates in the United States through its three principal subsidiaries, Ball-Foster Glass Container Co., Certain Teed Corporation and Norton Company.) He also was an Associate at Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz. Mr. Decker was the Chairman of the Committee of Corporate General Counsels of the American Bar Association (1998-July 2000). He also is a member of the ABA's Standing Committee on Professional Discipline and the ABA's Negotiated Acquisitions Committee. He was Chairman of the Pennsylvania Board of Law Examiners (1998-2000). He is a former member of the Board of Trustees of the Philadelphia Bar Foundation. He is a member of the Board of Business Advisors of the University of Virginia Law School, and the Board of Trustees of the Gesu School. Mr. Decker also served as a Director of Pierce Leahy Corporation. Formerly he was a member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Manufacturers, Pennsylvania Business Roundtable, American Corporate Counsel Association (Chairman of the Policy Committee) and was formerly the Chairman of the Philadelphia Municipal Authority.

Mr. Decker received his J.D. from the University of Virginia School of Law and a B.A. in history from the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Decker served in the United States Army, earning the rank of Captain.

MARY M. DEVLIN is Regulation Counsel, American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility, where she directs the Association's efforts in improving lawyer and judicial disciplinary enforcement and serves as liaison to the National Organization of Bar Counsel. She has been involved in professional ethics and discipline for the past nineteen years, previously serving as counsel to the American Medical Association's Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs. She is the author of over 50 articles. Her J.D. from I.I.T. Chicago-Kent College of Law was with honors. She received an LL.M. from DePaul University College of Law in 1996. She has a master's degree in library science from Dominican University and one from the University of Illinois at Chicago in history. She is a Fellow of the American Bar Foundation.

GERALD M. EISENSTAT is an attorney in the private practice of law in the firm of Eisenstat, Gabage, Berman & Furman, P.C., Vineland, New Jersey. He is a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline, member of the ABA House of Delegates and a past-president of the Cumberland County and New Jersey State Bar Associations. He is an active trial attorney involved in professional education, past president of the Trial Attorneys of the State of New Jersey and was an initial member of the New Jersey Supreme Court Committee on Trial Attorney Specialization Certification. He is a graduate of Dickinson College and of Dickinson School of Law.

PAULA J. FREDERICK is Chair, of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline. She is Deputy General Counsel for the State Bar of Georgia. She is a 1979 graduate of Duke University and received her J.D. from Vanderbilt University School of Law in 1982. She spent six years as a lawyer with the Atlanta Legal Aid Society before joining the Office of the General Counsel at the State Bar of Georgia in 1988. Ms. Frederick heads the disciplinary unit and serves as managing attorney for the Office of the General Counsel at the State Bar of Georgia. She is a frequent writer and lecturer on ethics topics and is AV rated by Martindale-Hubbell. She is Immediate Past President of the Atlanta Bar Association and a past president of the Georgia Association of Black Women Attorneys.

BARBARA KERR HOWE was an Associate Judge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, MD and has just retired from that position. After appointment in 1988, she was elected to that bench in 1990 for a fifteen-year term. She served as a director of the Attorney Grievance Commission in Maryland from 1983-1985 after having served on its Inquiry Panels for a number of years. She was a member of the Judicial Disabilities Commission of Maryland from 1991 through 1995, having been its Chair during 1995. The University of Maryland Law School awarded her JD in June 1969. The Court of Appeals of Maryland admitted her to practice in December 1969. Thereafter, she was a partner in a law firm engaged in general practice. Judge Howe is a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline. She is a past president of the Maryland State Bar Association (1996-97), a member of the ABA Standing Committee on Professionalism from 1995- 1998, chair of the Professionalism and Professional Responsibility Committee of the ABA General Practice Solo and Small Firm Section, a member and director of the American Judicature Society, the National Association of Women Judges and a fellow of the Maryland Bar Foundation and of the American Bar Foundation.

JEROME LARKIN has served as Deputy Administrator of the Illinois Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission since 1988. Prior Commission experience consisted of progression through staff counsel positions, culminating in appointment as Chief Counsel in 1984 and Assistant Administrator in 1986. He has investigated, litigated and appealed numerous attorney discipline cases. He served as President of the National Organization of Bar Counsel.

He received his J.D. from Loyola Law School of Chicago and served as a member of the board of Governors of the Loyola Law Alumni Association.

JUDGE MARY M. LISI is a judge for the United States District Court of Rhode Island. Prior to her judicial appointment in 1994, she served as the Chief Disciplinary Counsel for the Rhode Island Supreme Court. Previously, she served as Director of the Office of the Court Appointed Special Advocate for the Rhode Island Family Court and as a consultant to the U.S. Department of Justice. She has also served on the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on Professional Discipline. She received her J.D. with honors from the Temple University School of Law in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and her B.A. from the University of Rhode Island.

ELLYN S. ROSEN is the Associate Regulation Counsel at the American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility, where she works with Regulation Counsel Mary M. Devlin to improve lawyer and judicial disciplinary enforcement nationwide. Prior to joining the Center, she was a senior litigation counsel with the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois, where she investigated and prosecuted allegations of lawyer misconduct for six and one-half years. Ms. Rosen co-chaired the Chicago Bar Association's Young Lawyers Section Professional Responsibility Committee, for the 1997-98 through 1999-00 bar years. She is an investigator and interviewer for the Alliance of Bar Associations for Judicial Evaluations. The Alliance of Bar Associations consists of the Illinois State Bar Association and ten special interest bar associations who evaluate candidates for election and appointment to the bench in Illinois. She received her J.D. with honors from the Indiana University School of Law in Bloomington, Indiana.